REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter in this application.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claim 2 has been amended to obviate the rejection. Support for this amendment is in paragraphs 0071 and 0072 of the U.S. publication (No. US 2007/0037611). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner has rejected claim 11 because it is not clear what defines a thumb motion or enough clearance. Applicant has reviewed the claim, and has determined that claim 11 makes no mention of "thumb motion" or "clearance". However, Applicant has amended claim 11 to render the rejection moot. Therefore, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 12 because "it is not clear what defines enough clearance in order to be operated independently." Applicant has amended claim 12 to render the rejection moot. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 because it is not exactly clear what an "operating load" for each button would comprise. Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to the explanation of operating load in paragraph 103 in the patent publication (No. US 2007/0037611). It states, "Here, both the first operation button 3 and the second operation button 4 are used to execute the same pushing operation, but an operating load of the direction switch 31 is set two times or more larger than an operating load of the pressure-sensitive operating device 41.

Therefore, since respective reactions of the finger received from the first operation button 3 and the second operation button 4 are different, the operator can easily discriminate which one of both buttons is pushed down, based on a pushing feeling, and thus the wrong operation can be prevented." In other words, the "operating load" is the amount of force required to operate the buttons. Thus, the term "operating load" would be definite to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The Examiner has rejected claims 14 and 15 because it is not clear how the buttons could be coupled to the same elastic body and still be able to rotate. Nothing in the claims states that the buttons have an ability to rotate. Indeed, the buttons do not need to rotate according to the invention. Specifically, the second operation button can be a pressure sensitive operative device, wherein the "tracing operation" of the second operation button senses pressure in either the clockwise direction or the counterclockwise direction of operation. See Paragraph 0061 of the publication. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-6, 11-13, and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Yang (U.S. Application No. 2004/0121816) in view of Silverstone (U.S. Patent No. 4,185,281). For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. The asserted combination of Yang and Silverstone, independently or in combination, does not teach or suggest all features of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations from the specification, thereby rendering the rejection moot. See paragraph 0069 of the publication for support. Neither Yang nor Silverstone disclose that the controlling unit has an operation button that senses directional "pressure around the operation button diameter". Yang merely provides joysticks and Silverstone merely provides knobs. Thus, "pressure around the operation button diameter" is not taught, suggested or otherwise rendered obvious or predictable by the resulting combination.

Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to include limitations from claim 4. The combination of Yang and Silverstone fail to disclose that the display contents on the displaying unit are changed at a speed which corresponds to the "speed of the operation applied to operating unit". Applicant asserts that the cited combination discloses *timing* of inputting a signal caused by an operation of a knob or a joystick, and *timing* of changing a display which corresponds to the timing of inputting the signal. Therefore, even if Yang were combined with Silverstone, every limitation of claim 1 would not be taught, suggested, or otherwise rendered obvious or predictable by the resulting combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-10 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Yang in view of Silverstone. The asserted combination of Yang and Silverstone does not disclose the use of peripheral buttons. The combination provides a navigation device in the form of a "joystick". A joystick can be best described as an apparatus that has a length protruding from the face of the device at a perpendicular angle to the face. The joystick has the ability to be tilted in different directions while maintaining substantial perpendicularity with the face of the device. The tilting of the joystick navigates the menus in the device. Silverstone provides rotatable knobs; Yang provides a joystick that is lacking concentrically arranged buttons. Applicant asserts that the combination cannot put a joystick "around" a button. Consequently, the combination of Yang and Silverstone fail to teach or otherwise render obvious or predictable every limitation of claim 11.

Additionally, if a joystick were to be implemented as the center button as suggested in the combination, the joystick's length would inhibit and interfere with the operation of the peripheral

buttons. Again, the asserted combination of Yang and Silverstone does not render claim 11 obvious.

Finally, Silverstone is a device used in the aviation industry. One of ordinary skill in the art of mobile digital devices would not look to the aviation industry for determining the best way to optimize menu navigation in a mobile device. Therefore, the combination between Yang and Silverstone is improper.

Claims 12-19 depend directly or indirectly on claim 11, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-39858.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /michaelwgarvey/
Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

DATE: January 5, 2009